



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By George Galloway, D.Phil., D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914. Pp. xii, 602. International Theological Library.

Dr. Galloway's name is already well known to students of religious philosophy through his earlier works, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, and *The Principles of Religious Development*. In the present volume he has undertaken the task of giving a systematic treatment of the whole field. The result is a book which may be called, not in any disparagement but in the large German sense of the words, a text-book. It is likely to serve in that capacity for some time to come, since the author has, in addition to wide knowledge, a style which, if not very distinguished, has the supreme merit of clearness. There is never any doubt as to what Dr. Galloway means.

When we compare this book with those of the previous generation; with Martineau or the Cairds, for example, we become conscious of a change of spirit. It might be expressed by saying that the philosophy of religion has become more objective. The whole problem is not now comprised in the development of a speculative theory of religion; the philosopher feels himself compelled to approach the central problem of validity through an independent study of the empirical data. Thus Dr. Galloway devotes at least half his book to the discussion of the historical development of religion and the psychology of the religious consciousness. This increased "objectivity" undoubtedly involves a certain loss of artistic unity, and it also makes very large demands on the learning of a writer; as Dr. Galloway modestly remarks, "it is too much to expect that the religious philosopher can personally traverse this broad territory and make himself acquainted with all its various features." Yet this new attitude has obvious compensations from the point of view of the reader; we may learn with confidence facts and tendencies from a writer whose philosophical opinions may be unacceptable.

Space compels me to pass over Dr. Galloway's account of the development of religion with the summary statement that it is eminently clear and fair. He does not maintain that a survey of the course of religious evolution can be made a logical ground for holding the validity of religious belief. After the closest study of the facts it may still be possible to regard them as the working out of a few "pathetic fallacies." Nevertheless, he

holds, for one who comes to the study of the facts with a faith based on a personal affirmation they may be a support and confirmation. In dealing with the nature of the religious consciousness Dr. Galloway agrees with those theologians, of whom Dr. Caldecott is a distinguished example, who, while disclaiming the one-sidedness of Schleiermacher, maintain that the central element in religious experience is to be found in feeling. And this may be admitted without prejudice to the "personalist" view which Dr. Galloway would also adopt, that religious faith is an affair of the whole personality; for will and idea are involved in the advance of feeling to greater definiteness and content.

No claim is made by our author that any existing form of Christianity is the culmination of religious evolution or the "absolute" religion. He is content to urge that Christianity, more adequately than any of its rivals, answers the needs of the religious consciousness. Three points of superiority may fairly be alleged: First, the religious relation is conceived as personal; secondly, the idea of God is definitely and completely ethical; thirdly, the ideal of the Kingdom of God reconciles the individual and the social aspects of religious aspiration. I think I do not misinterpret Dr. Galloway by saying that he looks for a universal spiritual religion which shall be a development and a simplification of historical Christianity.

Probably most readers will turn with greatest interest to the author's philosophical defence of Theism and his attempt to construct a Theistic cosmology. Dr. Galloway evidently decided that loyalty to his readers required him to go once more through the traditional "proofs," though it is clear that he thinks the time has come when they should be allowed to sink into the background. He does not pretend that the existence of God can be made the conclusion of a rigidly cogent line of reasoning. He does maintain however that a probable argument of great force, which will support the venture of a personal faith, can be developed from two standpoints. Along metaphysical lines we are led to complete our thought by the conception of a World-Ground; through reflection on the implications of the moral consciousness we are led to the idea of a Supreme Value, who is at least personal. When Dr. Galloway comes to work out his view of the universe we find clear indications that he has felt the influence of the reaction against Absolutism. With William James he protests against the "Block Universe;" with the New Realists

he denies that Idealism can explain the concrete facts of experience. I think that he does not always do justice to the views of Absolute Idealism; probably Mr. Bradley's recent volume of essays was published too late to be made use of. Dr. Galloway treats, for example, the contrast between Reality and appearance as if it were admittedly a contrast between Reality and illusion. It is quite an arguable position that this is in truth the outcome of Mr. Bradley's philosophy, but it is hardly fair to ignore altogether the doctrine of degrees of reality. Dr. Galloway's own theory is a pluralistic Theism not unlike that which Dr. James Ward has suggested in his *Realm of Ends*. The universe, on this view, contains created monads in various levels of development. These monads are distinct from, and, in a limited degree, independent of the Supreme Monad. Through an undetermined process of evolution they are working towards a common End. Such in the main is Dr. Galloway's view, but he has felt the difficulties of explaining interaction so deeply that he has been constrained to add to the theory. He asks to be allowed to postulate a created medium within which the monads exist, and he suggests that this medium is psychical in character though below the level of the least developed monad. "Reduced to its lowest terms the order of existence consists of simple monads interacting within a common medium or environment, the whole forming a system of which an ultimate will is the ever present Ground." Dr. Galloway puts forward this view in a tentative manner and it will deserve careful scrutiny. At first sight some obvious difficulties suggest themselves. It is not clear that the problem of interaction will be made easier by introducing another factor which must itself enter into relations. Again, Dr. Galloway himself rightly protests against the use of the words "spirit" and "experience" as if they had any meaning apart from personality and subject. Might not much the same considerations be brought against a psychical reality which is not attached to any conscious centre? I have an uneasy feeling that if we grant Dr. Galloway his monads and his medium we might find that we could do very well without his God.

One further perplexity may perhaps be briefly noticed. It is obvious that for Dr. Galloway's theory change and progress are ultimately real. Yet he maintains most strongly and justly that the End of evolution cannot be conceived as existing within the temporal order. The Temporal Order thus points beyond it-

self to a Transcendent Order. We learn however that the Transcendent Order itself is subject to change and movement, "for there could be no consciousness apart from changing psychical states." Thus we should be carried on to think of an End of the Transcendent Order not contained in that order, and so to an indefinite regress of orders of reality each with its End in a higher plane of being. What is the End of all orders of reality? Admitting that the goal of evolution cannot be conceived as a part of the evolutionary process itself, the Absolute Idealist may plausibly assert that he has the only final interpretation of this fact in his conception of a Reality which abides in changeless perfection.

I am conscious that the limits of a review have not allowed me to do anything like justice to this important book. In particular some notice should have been given to the excellent sections which deal with the nature of religious doctrines and with revelation. An admirable feature of Dr. Galloway's treatment is his emphasis on the part played by great creative personalities. In conclusion, it may not be impertinent to say that this book leaves the impression of a mind which is still living and developing. It is to be hoped, for the sake both of theology and philosophy, that, either in his present sphere or in some academic position, its author will find leisure to carry his thought still further.

W. R. MATTHEWS.

University College, London, England.

SOCIAL REFORMS: As related to realities and delusions; an examination of the increase and distribution of wealth, from 1801 to 1910. By W. H. Mallock. London: John Murray, 1912. Pp. xii, 391.

This is a sad, almost a prehistoric book. The word "reformer" is used throughout as a term of reproach, and all modern "social reform" is regarded with frank hostility. Mr. Mallock objects even to the discrimination, for purpose of income tax, between earned and unearned income (p. 298). "Reformers," he thinks, are "a supersensitive class . . . affected by the spectacle of suffering more acutely than they would be by the experience of it" (p. 4).

The main thesis of this book is that the poor are not really poor, nor the rich really rich; there is really no great inequality